



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,622	10/27/2003	Larry Lee Roundy	199-0065US	2614
29855 7590 07/28/2008 WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070				
			EXAMINER NGUYEN, QUYNH H	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/28/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,622

Applicant(s)

ROUNDY ET AL.

Examiner

QUYNH H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 5/23/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8-10,12-15 and 17-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,10,12-15 and 17-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment filed 05/23/08 has been entered. Claims 1, 4, 10, 12, 15, and 17 have been amended. Claims 3, 11, and 16 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 1 and 3-18 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 10, and 15 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan et al. (US Patent 6,219,840 in view of Tanitsu (JP409200319A) and further in view of Picklesimer (US Patent 5,197,062).

As to claims 1, 10, and 15, Corrigan et al. teaches the steps of: placing incoming calls in a list / single channel (col. 4, lines 32-43 - *where Corrigan discussed a voice telephone call can be placed in an available single channel 218*); analyzing the incoming calls to determine video channel type and moving the incoming calls to a list / six TDMA channels (col. 4, lines 43-56; col. 6, lines 36-61).

Corrigan et al. does not explicitly teach receiving at least two incoming calls that occur within a time interval less than that required to process an incoming ISDN call; and analyzing each of the incoming calls uses a framing listening technique. However, since Corrigan et al. teaches video conferencing services (col. 6, lines 36-40), hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that there at least two incoming calls in a conference environment, otherwise there would be no conference.

Tanitsu teaches receiving two simultaneous incoming calls to ISDN lines (See Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Tanitsu into the teachings of Corrigan in order to have a more efficient system and responding to simultaneous incoming calls promptly and surely without missing any important incoming call. Corrigan and Tanitsu do not teach analyzing each of the incoming calls uses a framing listening technique.

Picklesimer teaches analyzing the calls uses a framing listening technique (col. 7, line 58 through col. 8, line 8; col. 6, lines 25-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made the teachings of Picklesimer into the teachings of Corrigan and Tanitsu for the purpose of having a more efficient system and generating time division multiplexed data for multiple channels simultaneously.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan, Tanitsu, and Picklesimer, and further in view of Ahuja et al. (US Patent 6,175,575).

As to claim 8, Corrigan et al. teaches grouping an incoming call with other channels comprising a video call (col. 6, line 36 through col. 7, line 5). Corrigan, Tanitsu, and Picklesimer do not teach calculating delay compensation.

Ahuja et al. teaches calculating delay compensation (col. 7, line 54 through col. 8, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahuja into the teachings of Corrigan, Tanitsu, and Picklesimer for the purpose of having a more efficient system by reducing the bandwidth have been transmitted and the overall system load drops, as discussed by Ahuja (col. 8, lines 1-7).

5. Claims 4-7, 12-14, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan, Tanitsu, and Picklesimer, and further in view of Gilman et al. (US Patent 5,757,781).

As to claims 4-5, 7, 12-13, and 17, Corrigan, Tanitsu, and Picklesimer do not teach the framing technique distinguishes between H.221 framing, bonding channel framing, and transmitting a multi-frame pattern.

Gilman et al. teaches the framing technique distinguishes between H.221 framing, bonding channel framing, and transmitting a multi-frame pattern (col. 5, lines 9-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gilman into the teachings of Corrigan, Tanitsu, and Picklesimer in order to have a more efficient system and distinguishing between framings.

As to claims 6, 14, and 18, Corrigan, Tanitsu, Picklesimer and Gilman do not teach determining whether a previously sent video unit identifier has been returned. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made the above mentioned feature in order to have a more efficient system and assisting the processing steps of determining video channel type.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claim 9, prior art of record fails to teach, or render obvious, alone or in combination a method for processing incoming ISDN calls comprising: receiving at least two incoming calls; receiving a value representing a transfer flag; receiving a value representing a channel identifier; receiving a value representing at least one of a physical video unit identifier and a group identifier; receiving a value representing a rate multiplier; and receiving a value representing a bonding mode; placing each of the incoming calls in a temporary call list; analyzing each of the incoming calls to determine

video channel type; and moving each of the incoming calls to a permanent list based on the channel type of the call.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to QUYNH H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Quynh H Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614